

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

1. Amendments to Claims

The claim listing above includes the new claim numbers set forth by the Examiner in item 4 on page 3 of the Official Action. All references herein are to the re-numbered claims.

The subject matter of claim 74 has been added to claim 65. However, the functional language at the end of original claim 65 has been deleted. It is nevertheless believed that amended claim 65 should be allowable for the reasons set forth in item 12 on page 8 of the Official Action, which indicated the allowability of original claim 74.

All claims now depend from amended claim 65, except for claims 89-92. Claim 89 has been re-written in independent form even though the indication of allowable subject matter does not include claims 89-92, the patentability of which is discussed below.

New claims 134-140 recite clutch CL102, which was inadvertently omitted from the original claims. Clutch CL102 permits the engine to be used as the sole power source since engagement of clutch CL102, in contrast to engagement of centrifugal clutch FC101, does not depend on the speed of the output shaft.

Support for new claim 132 is found on page 16 of the original specification and in function (9) of original claim 1. Support for new claim 133 is also found on page 16 of the original specification and in function (7) of original claim 1.

2. Formalities

Page 18, line 1 of the substitute specification has been corrected in the manner suggested in item 3 on page 2 of the Official Action.

3. Rejection of Claims 73 and 95-101 Under 35 USC §112, 2nd Paragraph

This rejection has been addressed by correcting the dependencies of claims 73 and 95 in the manner suggested by the Examiner in item 7 on page 4 of the Official Action.

4. Rejection of Claims 65-71, 75-78, 80, 89, and 90 Under 35 USC §102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,044,922 (Field)

Except with respect to claims 89-92, this rejection has been rendered moot by the addition to claim 65 of the limitations of original claim 74, indicated as allowable in item 12 on page 8 of the Official Action. The deletion of the certain functional language from claim 65 is not believed to affect the indicated allowability of the claimed subject matter.

With respect to claims 89-92, it is respectfully submitted that the Field patent neither discloses nor suggests a transmission corresponding to transmission *mechanism* T101, as recited in claim 89, for connecting the secondary dynamo-electric unit to the engine. Instead, secondary dynamo-electric unit 28 of Field is directly connected to engine 28 by a belt and pulley. In addition, it is respectfully noted that the subject matter of claims 91 and 92 is indicated as allowable in item 12 on page 8 of the Official Action.

Because the Field patent does not disclose all elements recited in claims 89-92, and in view of the indicated allowability of the subject matter of original claim 74, now included in claim 65, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC §102(b) is respectfully requested.

5. Rejection of Claims 72 and 73 Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,044,922 (Field) and 6,394,924 (Schiebold)

This rejection has been rendered moot by the addition to claim 65, from which claims 72 and 73 depend, of the limitations of original claim 74.

Having thus overcome each of the rejections made in the Official Action, withdrawal of the rejections and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Serial Number 09/982,178

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA
Registration No. 33,805

Date: December 18, 2003

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500

NWB:S:\Producer\NewPending\Q...\ZYVYANO98217\at02.wpd